

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

BARTHOLOMEW M. MAHONEY, JR.,  
Appellant,

vs.

BONNIE M. MAHONEY,  
Respondent.

BARTHOLOMEW M. MAHONEY, JR.,  
Appellant,

vs.

BONNIE M. MAHONEY,  
Respondent.

No. 82412

No. 82413

**FILED**

JUL 06 2021

ELIZABETH A. BROWN  
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT  
BY *[Signature]*  
DEPUTY CLERK

*ORDER REINSTATING BRIEFING*

These appeals are from a post-divorce decree order reducing arrearages to judgment and an order awarding attorney fees and costs. Because it appeared that appellant had filed a timely tolling motion and that the district court had not resolved the motion, this court directed appellant to show cause why the appeal in Docket No. 82412 should not be dismissed for lack of jurisdiction. *See* NRAP 4(a) (a timely tolling motion pursuant to NRCP 50(b), 52(b), or for a motion to alter or amend or for a new trial pursuant to NRCP 59 terminates the 30-day appeal period, and a notice of appeal is of no effect if it is filed after such a tolling motion is filed and before the district court enters a written order finally resolving the motion). Appellant has responded and explains that the motion he filed was a motion to set aside the judgment pursuant to NRCP 60(b) and therefore it did not toll the time to appeal under NRAP 4(a). Accordingly, it appears that this court has jurisdiction and this appeal may proceed. Appellant shall have 60 days from the date of this order to file and serve a single opening

brief and an appendix in these consolidated appeals. Thereafter, briefing shall proceed in accordance with NRAP 31(a)(1).

It is so ORDERED.

Radford J. Smith, C.J.

cc: The Grigsby Law Group  
Radford J. Smith, Chartered